

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached two drawing sheets includes a changes to FIGS. 1 and 4, and replace the original drawing sheets that included FIGS. 1 and 4 thereon. In FIGS. 1 and 4, missing and incorrect reference numerals have been corrected. Further, the depiction of the mobile storage devices 1 in Fig. 4, have been made consistent with FIG. 1.

Attachment: Two Replacement sheets.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 23 February 2006. Responsive to the Office Action, Claims 1-20 have been cancelled and new Claims 21-38 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in paragraphs 10, 18, 19, 20, 23, and 28, and FIGS. 2 and 3. The Specification and drawings have been amended to correct errors found therein. No new matter has been added by those changes.

Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC §112

Claim 11, 13-15, 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Cancellation of Claims 11, 13-15, 18-20 renders their rejections moot.

Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehtonen (US 2001/0049262A1). The examiner cites the Abstract, Fig. 3 and

paragraphs [0011] to [0017] of Lehtonen to support his position that Lehtonen inherently teaches a headset (read on mobile storage device) which comprises a Bluetooth transceiver attached thereto for providing handsfree functions of mobile calls, files transfer, and playing music to a user.

Claims 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Lehtonen in view of Reshefsky (US Patent Number 6,873,862). The examiner cites Abstract, Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 17-36 of Reshefsky to support his assertion that Reshefsky teaches a headphone for connecting to an MP3 player as well as to a cellular phone, wherein a control switch is switched automatically upon receiving an incoming call.

Cancellation of Claims 1-20 renders their rejections moot.

With respect to the newly added Claims 21-38, the mobile storage device of new Claim 21 of the present invention is, however, designed to comprise a Bluetooth earphone module movably inserted into the storage device and connected to the memory control module and the MP3 processing module to accomplish wireless transmission of digital data or voice signals with a remote device using the same frequency and channel. The wireless transmission function of the mobile storage device of Claim 21 is provided by the Bluetooth earphone

module. In other words, the present invention provides a wireless transmission function of a mobile storage device, and the wireless transmission function of the mobile storage device is disabled once the Bluetooth earphone module is detached from the mobile storage device.

In conclusion, at least the movable Bluetooth earphone module of Claim 21 has never been taught or implied by Lehtonen or Reshefsky. Therefore, Claim 21 is patentable in view of Lehtonen and Reshefsky.

Since Claims 22-38 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 21 and Claim 21 is believed to be patentable. Thus, Claims 22-38 are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 21.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the new claims are appropriate and can place the subject application in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

This Amendment was prepared by Applicant, and is being submitted without substantive change by the undersigned Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
For: Rosenberg Klein & Lee



David I. Klein
Registration No. 33,253

Dated: *28 July 2006*

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
3458 Ellicott Center Drive, Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410)465-6678
Customer No. 04586